



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT BUDGET ANALYST REPORT

Date Issued: September 21, 2012

IBA Report Number: 12-39

Budget and Finance Committee Docket Date: September 26, 2012

Item Number: 8

Capital Improvement Program: Public Input and the Need for a Multi-year Plan

OVERVIEW

Citizens and community, public interest, and business groups have raised concerns about certain elements of the City's approach to its Capital Improvement Program (CIP) during a number of City Council and Committee meetings throughout FY 2012 and early FY 2013, including discussion and approval of the Five-Year Deferred Capital Funding Plan, CIP Streamlining Measures, and FY 2013 CIP budget. Many of these concerns focus on the desire for (1) increased public involvement in identifying or prioritizing needed projects, (2) better communication from City staff, and (3) increased transparency over the CIP process.

During the July 25, 2012 Budget and Finance Committee meeting, Public Works-Engineering & Capital Projects (E&CP) staff proposed to incorporate formal outreach to the public into the FY 2014 CIP budget development process. E&CP staff suggested that structured outreach efforts could be facilitated through the Community Planners Committee (CPC). The community planning structure has been in place since 1976 and the City has 42 Community Planning Groups—the Chair of the active groups sits on the CPC. CPC's role is to ensure communication and solicit citizen input on issues among the various planning groups. During the meeting, Budget and Finance Committee Members agreed that CPC was the preferred structure for conducting public outreach and requested that City staff report back to the Committee on their outreach efforts in September 2012.

During the July 25th Budget and Finance Committee meeting, our office agreed that it is important to solicit public input into the CIP budget process, but noted that since involvement at this point is still late in the planning process, it is difficult for the public to effect change. Further, we noted that optimal infrastructure planning requires the development of a Citywide, Multi-year Capital Improvement Plan and that public input would be a vital part of this plan. Budget and Finance Committee members agreed with the need for such a plan and requested that

the IBA assess the feasibility of a Multi-year Capital Improvement Plan by reviewing and providing information on how other cities approach infrastructure planning.

To provide a solid foundation of knowledge on the CIP and based on discussions with representatives from the public, including the Community Budget Alliance, our office has developed a Citizen's Guide to the Capital Improvement Program. This Guide can be used in conjunction with our [Citizen's Guide to the City's Operating Budget](#) which provides an outline of how the monies coming into the City will be spent to operate and maintain City functions and services. These companion documents are available on our website:

<http://www.sandiego.gov/iba/otherdocs/index.shtml>

This report includes information on E&CP's public outreach efforts through the CPC; the need for the City to develop a Multi-year Capital Improvement Plan; and four other cities' approaches to capital planning, including Denver, CO; San Francisco, CA; Houston, TX; and San Antonio, TX. This report also provides our assessment of how the City of San Diego has a unique opportunity to take steps for developing a Multi-year Capital Improvement Plan

Fiscal/Policy Discussion

Public Input for the FY 2014 CIP Budget

Public outreach to obtain input for the FY 2014 CIP Budget through the CPC began in August and will continue through November 2012. The following outlines key steps that have been taken or are underway.

August 2012 - For the initial steps, E&CP staff worked with an Ad Hoc Committee of the CPC throughout August to educate on the CIP and establish realistic expectations for available funding. After significant discussion and consideration, the Ad Hoc Committee recommended obtaining public input through the 42 Community Planning Groups. The recommended approach, which was approved by the full CPC on August 28th, establishes roles and responsibilities throughout the process for City staff, the CPC, and Community Planning Groups.

September 2012 - In September, City staff conducted three training sessions for Community Planning Group representatives to provide an education on the CIP and budget process and establish realistic expectation of available funding for projects. Additionally, E&CP staff undertook a significant effort to develop and provide important information to serve as a starting point for Community Planning Group discussions. First, comprehensive lists of existing capital projects and project information, such as necessary funding to complete the project, were developed for each community planning area and disseminated both electronically and during the training sessions. Second, E&CP staff requested condition assessments and unfunded needs lists from each of the asset-owning departments—such as Transportation & Storm Water and Park & Recreation—and compiled this information. The availability of this information and format and level of detail of the lists varied greatly across departments. Condition assessments and unfunded needs lists have been made available to the public on the CPC's website:

<http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/community/cpc/resources.shtml>

Going forward, E&CP staff will continue to serve as an ongoing resource to provide information and address questions as needed.

During the training sessions, the CPC provided general guidelines for Community Planning Groups in identifying needs, priorities, and project requests, including an optional priority scoring form and a standardized project request form. The CPC Chair also recommended that Groups use the information provided by E&CP staff as a starting point for project requests; take a realistic approach to requesting projects given the limited available funding; and ensure that project requests are prioritized. The CPC will also provide support as requested by Community Planning Group representatives and advocate for aggressive public outreach within each community.

September-November 2012 – Community Planning Groups will conduct public outreach and hold meetings to obtain input on needed community projects and discuss priorities. Prioritized project requests must be submitted to the CPC by November 7th. The CPC will subsequently package the information without making any substantive changes and transmit to City staff by November 23rd.

Assessing Community Group Requests

The approach that the City will use to assess Community Planning Group project requests submitted by the CPC has not been formally established, but staff anticipate creating a task force of representatives from the asset-owning departments as well as other departments responsible for various aspects of the CIP, such as Financial Management and Development Services (Planning and Facilities Financing Divisions). This effort would include evaluating planning group requests along with needs and priorities established by each department and determining whether funding is available for priority projects. Potentially, some of the priority projects may be included in departmental FY 2014 budget proposals which will be forwarded to the CIP Review and Advisory Committee (CIPRAC)¹ and ultimately to the Mayor.

Challenges

CPC and Community Planning Group representatives recognize that this is a valuable opportunity to provide input for the FY 2014 CIP Budget, but also realize the challenges they are facing:

- The CIP process is complex and involves many players and there is a steep learning curve, but having a good level of understanding is important to facilitate valuable input.
- The CIP is constrained by limited available funding and funding sources that have often have specific restrictions on how they can be used. In addition, much of the funding in the City's CIP is being allocated to projects in order to comply with laws and mandates. As a result, there is typically little discretionary funding; only a few of the projects requested that are not already ongoing or among departments' priorities are likely to make it into the FY 2014 budget. City staff anticipate that viable project requests that do not make it into the budget will be put on applicable asset-owning departments' unfunded needs lists.
- Since the public outreach began in August, the timetable for FY 2014 is more compressed than it would be in future years. Representatives are concerned that the tight

¹ CIPRAC reviews proposed projects from a Citywide perspective and forwards budget recommendations for the Mayor's approval. CIPRAC is chaired by the Assistant Chief Operating Officer and includes senior-level officials from asset-owning City departments and departments that have responsibility for the CIP, such as FM and E&CP.

timeframe could affect Community Planning Groups' outreach efforts to citizens in their communities and other stakeholders. In addition, the short timeline could impact representatives ability to fully understand the CIP, review the information provided by E&CP staff, and provide well thought out project requests and priorities.

The CPC is encouraging Community Planning Groups to report back on their outreach efforts and lessons learned so that the process can be improved for future years.

Challenges Highlight the Need for a Multi-Year Capital Plan

The City's outreach to the public through the CPC for the FY 2014 CIP Budget is an important step in soliciting input on community needs and priorities. However, the challenges faced by Community Planning Group representatives and City staff during this process highlight the City's need for a Multi-year Capital Improvement Plan. City staff can more effectively plan for CIP projects to address community needs over five-years (or more) rather than in an annual budget. A Multi-year Plan will also enable staff to plan in advance to identify needed funding for projects, such as bond issuances, federal and state grants, and other opportunities. Many grants and other funding opportunities must be applied for well in advance of receiving funds and often require that a Multi-year Plan be in place.

The City has various long-term, strategic plans, such as the General Plan and community plans. A Multi-year Capital Plan would provide an effective vehicle for implementing the needed projects so that the visions, policies, and guidelines set forth in these plans will be realized. In addition, a Multi-year Capital Plan could link other City plans—such as the the Regional Transportation Improvement Plan for TransNet-funded projects and the Five-Year Deferred Capital Funding Plan for facilities, streets, and storm drains—to decrease duplication and identify Citywide deficiencies or gaps. Ultimately, a Multi-year Capital Plan will enable the Mayor, City Council, department staff, members of the public, and other stakeholders to look forward and develop a comprehensive infrastructure improvement strategy for the City.

Other Cities' Approaches to Infrastructure and CIP Planning

We identified a number of cities that have developed Multi-year Capital Improvement Plans to address deferred backlogs and ongoing infrastructure needs. We are providing examples of four cities that have been doing capital planning for several years, including Denver, CO; San Francisco, CA; Houston, TX; and San Antonio, TX. These cities have developed comprehensive plans that generally provide an assessment of capital infrastructure needs, the investment required to meet those needs, funding sources and projected revenue, and a strategy for financing projects where annual capital revenue falls short. The cities' plans differ on approaches and the number of years they cover, but have many important common themes, including:

- Solid knowledge and information on the condition of capital assets;
- Prioritization of ongoing and preventative maintenance for existing infrastructure;
- Significant public input on community needs;
- Transparency over the capital process, including how projects are selected and the status of ongoing projects;
- A strategy for financing capital needs that cannot be funded with available annual revenues; and

- Public involvement and support for voter-approved financing programs, like General Obligation (GO) Bonds.

Brief highlights from each of the cities' plans are discussed below, and more detail on the cities' profiles, approaches for developing the capital plan, and noteworthy accomplishments are included in Attachment 1.

Denver, CO

Denver's [Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan](#) includes \$458.5 million in capital expenditures over six years (2-11-2016). The Plan describes expected Citywide capital revenues and the allocation of these funds for capital expenditures; aligns capital discretionary spending with Citywide strategic goals and initiatives; highlights critical projects outside of annual available funding; and proposes financing strategies. The Capital Improvement Plan is organized around three major types of projects:

1. **Ongoing Payments** – This includes contractual obligations, certificate of participation financing, ongoing partnerships, and internal budget transfers. On average ongoing payments make up 14% of available capital revenue.
2. **Maintenance**– Annual maintenance programs comprise the majority of the CIP and reflect Denver's goal of maintaining or improving current service levels for all City assets. On average about 71% of available capital revenues are committed to annual maintenance programs.
3. **Discretionary Projects** – Once commitments to ongoing payments and maintenance are fulfilled, the Investment Committee makes recommendations to fund discretionary projects, such as major rehabilitation or investment in new assets. Only about \$10 million or 15% of revenue is projected to be available for discretionary projects in FY 2011.

Revenue - The Capital Improvement Fund provides 80% of revenues for Denver's Capital Program and is primarily funded through Property Tax Assessments. In 2007, the citizens of Denver recognized the need for ongoing maintenance and repair and voted to dedicate an additional 2.5 mills in increased property taxes to annually repair deteriorating infrastructure.

Unfunded Projects - The FY 2011-2016 Capital Plan includes \$413 million in priority unfunded discretionary projects. These projects are prioritized within three tiers and incorporated into a Six-year Workplan. The Workplan builds the foundation for future bond initiatives, creates a tool to facilitate capital programming, and helps to create institutional knowledge of capital needs.

San Francisco, CA

San Francisco began developing a [10-Year Capital Plan](#) in 2006 to address decades of underfunded infrastructure. The plan recommends \$24.8 billion in capital expenditures over ten years (FY 2012-2021) and is organized into sections by project-types, such as Public Safety and Infrastructure and Streets. Each section highlights the accomplishments and challenges for the specific assets, and includes:

- **Renewal** - Annual maintenance and "state of good repair" renewal needs, such as street resurfacing, tree maintenance, and repairs to City structures, are considered part of the "pay-as-you-go program." These projects primarily have been funded with General Fund revenue; the limited funding for these needs has led to a large backlog, decreased services, and increased operating costs. The most recent plan provided partial funding

for current renewal needs and recommended the issuance of a Safe Streets and Road Repair General Obligation (GO) Bond to fund \$248 million. The bond was approved by 68% of voters in 2011.

- **Enhancement** – This program includes major capital projects that will expand or enhance current assets and the current level of services, such as public right-of-way improvements to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- **Deferred and Emerging** – The Capital Plan is financially constrained and makes clear decisions on which projects receive funding given available resources. Over \$4 billion in deferred needs are tracked in the 10-year plan, ranging from Recreation and Park road improvements to seismic bracing of the San Francisco General Hospital buildings. Nearly 20% of these needs are due to underinvestment in basic state of good repair renewal during the past several decades. In addition to these deferred needs, the City tracks a number of emerging needs — items that may have scope or funding changes because they are dependent on development, litigation, or policy changes.

GO Bonds - San Francisco's recent accomplishments related to capital planning include voter approval of four GO Bonds since 2008 to fund capital improvements to parks, hospitals, emergency response, and streets.

Houston, TX

Houston established a capital planning process in 1983 which includes the development of a [Five-Year Capital Improvement Plan](#). The Plan calls for \$4.36 billion in appropriations during the five-year period (FY 2012-2016). For ease of finding projects, the plan is organized by department, such as Parks and Recreation and Fire. Information is included on project priority, capacity and timing constraints, and funding sources for all anticipated projects. The two major categories of programs included in the plan are:

- **Enterprise** – Enterprise fund programs make up \$2.84 billion or 65% of the total planned appropriations for FY 2012-2016 and are supported by revenues from the air travel industry, hotel occupancy tax, parking, and fees charged to water and wastewater commercial and residential customers.
- **Public Improvements Program** – The remaining \$1.52 billion or 35% over five years addresses a full range of capital facility and infrastructure improvements which will be financed with \$625 million in Public Infrastructure General Obligation Bonds approved by voters in 2006 and other funding sources, such as grants.

Public Input - Public meetings are held annually in each City Council district to provide citizens an opportunity to comment on the process and recommend projects to be included in the plan.

Process Manual - In 2011, the Public Works and Engineering Department developed a Capital Improvement Plan Process Manual to formalize processes and procedures for planning, including identifying needs and developing and prioritizing projects. The manual serves as guidance for asset-owning departments and provides consistency and transparency over the process.

San Antonio, TX

San Antonio's [Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan](#) represents the City's long-range physical infrastructure development and improvement plan. The FY 2013-2018 Plan includes 454 projects totaling \$2 billion over six years. Projects include new streets and sidewalks, drainage

enhancements, park and library facility rehabilitation, and public health and safety enhancements. Projects in the Capital Plan are evaluated each year to reflect changing priorities and current work progress and cost estimates.

San Antonio's Capital Plan includes a debt management plan and has served as the foundation for two large-scale voter-approved GO Bond Programs:

- 2007-2012 Bond Program - Provided \$550 million for improvements to streets, bridges, and sidewalks; drainage; parks, recreation, open space, and athletics; library; and public health facilities. 84% percent of these projects are now complete.
- 2012-2017 Bond Program - Provided \$596 million for 140 projects primarily focused on the City's core infrastructure areas—streets and drainage.

How Do We Get There?

Other cities' Multi-year Capital Improvement Plans discussed in this report provide some good ideas for San Diego, but it is important to recognize that these cities have been doing capital planning for several years and have developed comprehensive plans. The ultimate goal would be to have a comprehensive plan for San Diego, but it is important for the City to take initial steps toward this goal by assessing Citywide infrastructure needs and priorities, the investment required to meet those needs, funding sources and projected revenue, and identifying priority unfunded projects. The Mayor, City Council, department staff, community groups, business groups, and other stakeholders can use this information to develop financing strategies, such as issuing GO Bonds.

Through recent and ongoing efforts to improve the CIP process, the City now has some key elements needed for the development of a Multi-year Plan. The City Council approved a Five-Year Deferred Capital Funding Plan in March 2012. E&CP staff have planned projects for each of the five years which could provide a foundation for the Multi-year Capital Plan. In addition, the City's public outreach effort to obtain community input for the FY 2014 CIP Budget, for the first time, has provided or will provide some important elements needed for the development of a Multi-year Capital Plan. These include:

- A list of ongoing capital projects and project information developed by E&CP staff;
- Condition assessments and unfunded needs from each of the asset-owning departments;
- Prioritized capital needs and project requests from Community Planning Groups, which the City will receive in mid-November.

Also as part of public outreach efforts, a task force is being convened to assess communities' requests for projects. This provides a unique opportunity for staff to begin to look at projects and priorities and how they can be addressed over multiple years. Although it would be difficult to develop a draft Capital Plan for FY 2014, City staff could potentially conduct a pilot, for example developing a plan for a specific asset-type or including less than five years for this effort. Through this pilot, the task force could gain an understanding of the resources that may be needed to develop a Multi-year Plan and potentially recommend an approach for drafting a Multi-year Capital Plan for FY 2015. Staff could report the progress and the results of the pilot to the Budget and Finance Committee.

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATION

Improvements to infrastructure, such as streets, public facilities, and parks, improve the safety, mobility, and lifestyle of citizens and have a positive impact on the local economy. Further, the condition and sufficiency of infrastructure can significantly impact the tourism industry, which is a large part of the City's economy. Decisions made regarding the CIP are very important, because capital improvements projects are generally large and expensive, and the assets they create will likely be required for decades of public use. As San Diego continues to deal with budgetary and resource constraints, competing priorities, and an increasing backlog of deferred capital projects, it is clear that the City needs a Multi-year Capital Plan outlining an infrastructure improvement strategy.

Through recent and ongoing efforts to improve the CIP process, the City now has some key elements needed for the development of a Multi-year Plan. Further, the task force that is being convened to assess communities' requests for projects provides a unique opportunity for staff to begin to look at projects and priorities and how they can be addressed over multiple years. Conducting a pilot will enable staff to move forward on development of a Multi-year Capital Plan and continue the momentum of recent improvements to the CIP. Finally, public involvement and support in an infrastructure improvement strategy is vital to its success—both in providing input on community needs and priorities and helping to identify and support future financing efforts so that Citywide and community goals can be achieved.



Erin Noel
Fiscal & Policy Analyst



APPROVED: Andrea Tevlin
Independent Budget Analyst

Attachment 1: Profile of Comparative Cities' Multi-Year CIP Plans

Profile (FY 2013)	Development of Plan	Highlights of the Plan	Noteworthy Accomplishments
<p>City and County of Denver, CO</p> <p>Budget (Proposed) Operating \$1.5 billion CIP \$269.8 million Total \$1.8 billion</p> <p>Population: 600, 158 (Metro area 2.5 million)</p> <p>Area: 153.0 square miles</p> <p>Government: Strong-Mayor</p>	<p><u>Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan (2011-2016)</u></p> <p>City Agencies- Identify initiatives or objectives to be accomplished within the six years and list priority projects which support those objectives.</p> <p>Budget and Management Office – Provides information on expected revenues; works with each City agency to identify capital needs to recommend projects; prepares instructions and guidelines for the Six-Year Capital Program Plan; and reviews prioritized list of discretionary projects.</p> <p>Investment Committee – Made up of cabinet-level officials and is responsible for providing a Citywide look at available resources and priorities and serving as coordination mechanism for various City departments. Serves as the decision-making body to recommend funding for discretionary capital projects.</p> <p>The Mayor and City Council – With assistance from Budget and Management, are responsible for identifying funding and selecting projects to be implemented with the funds available as well as identifying critical needs that are not on the list.</p>	<p>The Capital Improvement Plan includes \$458.5 million in capital expenditures over six years (2011-2016) and is organized around three major types of projects:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ongoing Payments – On average ongoing payments are 14% of existing capital revenue for each of the six years. This includes contractual obligations, certificate of participation financing, ongoing partnerships, and internal budget transfers. 2. Maintenance – Annual maintenance programs comprise the majority of the CIP and reflect Denver's goal of maintaining or improving current service levels for all City assets. On average about 71% of available capital revenues are committed to annual maintenance programs for each of the six years. 3. Discretionary Projects – Once commitments to ongoing payments and maintenance are fulfilled, the Investment Committee makes recommendations to fund discretionary projects, such as major rehabilitation or investment in new assets. <p>Revenues – The Capital Improvement Fund provides 80% of revenues for the Capital Improvement Program and is primarily funded through Property Tax Assessments. In 2007, the citizens of Denver recognized the need for ongoing maintenance and repair and voted to dedicate an additional 2.5 mills in increased property taxes to annually repair deteriorating infrastructure.</p>	<p>The City's Investment Committee has identified \$413 million in major high-priority discretionary projects that will require funding beyond the scope of annual capital revenue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These projects would require bond or outside financing to be completed. • These projects are prioritized with three tiers and incorporated into a "Six-year Workplan" included in the Capital Improvement Plan. • The "Workplan" builds the foundation for future bond initiatives, creates a tool to facilitate capital programming, and helps to create institutional knowledge of capital needs. • The Plan also includes details on Priority Unfunded Discretionary Projects, including cost estimates and operational impacts.

Profile (FY 2013)	Development of Plan	Highlights of the Plan	Noteworthy Accomplishments
<p>City and County of San Francisco, CA</p> <p>Budget (Adopted) Operating \$7.0 billion CIP \$185.9 million Total \$7.4 billion</p> <p>Population: 805,235 (Metro area 4.3 million)</p> <p>Area: 46.9 square miles</p> <p>Government: Strong-Mayor</p>	<p><u>10-Year Capital Plan (FY 2012-2021)</u></p> <p>City Agencies- Identify initiatives or objectives to be accomplished within the six years and list priority projects which support those objectives.</p> <p>Capital Planning Program- Under the City Administrator, staff review and prioritize Capital Plan and Capital Budget requests; project revenues and coordinate funding sources and uses; produce the 10-year Capital Plan; provide policy analysis and reports on interagency capital planning; and provide staff support to the Capital Planning Committee.</p> <p>Capital Planning Committee – Is chaired by the City Administrator and includes the President of the Board of Supervisors, Mayor’s Finance Director, Controller, City Planning Director, Director of Public Works, Airport Director, Executive Director of Municipal Transportation Authority, General Manager of Public Utilities, General Manager of Recreation and Parks Department, and Executive Director of Port of San Francisco.</p> <p>This committee is responsible for annually reviewing and approving the Capital Plan, Capital Budget, and issuances of long-term debt; conducting special projects, such as studying long-term revenue options for street resurfacing; and making recommendations to the Mayor and Board of Supervisors on all of the City’s capital expenditures.</p>	<p>The plan includes \$24.8 billion in capital expenditures over ten years (FY 2012-2021) and is organized into sections by program/project-types, such as Public Safety and Infrastructure and Streets. Each section highlights the accomplishments and challenges for the specific assets, and includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Renewal – Annual maintenance and “state of good repair” renewal needs, such as street resurfacing, tree maintenance, and repairs to City structures, are considered part of the “pay-as-you-go program.” These projects primarily have been funded with General Fund revenue; the limited funding for these needs has led to a large backlog, decreased services, and increased operating costs. While, current renewal needs are only partially funded in the Capital Plan, it recommends increasing funding at 10% per year (5% growth and 5% inflation). The Plan includes options for a stable, long-term revenue source for street resurfacing. 2. Enhancement – Major capital projects that will expand or enhance current assets and the current level of services, such as public right-of-way improvements to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). 3. Deferred and Emerging Projects – While the plan proposes increased investments to meet an increasing percentage of renewal needs, it does not provide funds to reduce existing backlogs of deferred projects. The Plan also proposes deferral of several enhancement projects. <p><i>Debt Policy:</i> In order to maintain a strong financial position and have a low impact on taxpayers, the Capital Planning Committee, Mayor, and the Board have adopted two policies to limit the issuance of long term debt. First, the City will not increase the property tax rate above 2006 rates. This is possible even with existing and planned bond issuances, because the City issues new debt as it pays off old debt. Second, the City’s General Fund debt service payments are limited to 3.25% of discretionary revenues which limits the impact of debt on the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • San Francisco’s recent accomplishments include voter-approval of four GO Bonds since 2008 to fund capital improvements to parks, hospitals, emergency response, and streets. • In 2006, the Municipal Transit Authority initiated a capital asset management program to identify all assets; determine their condition and lifecycles; identify the optimal maintenance schedule; and identify gaps and needed capital projects. This process has helped the Transit Authority to have a solid basis for needed projects and to look forward to identify potential financing options.

Profile (FY 2013)	Development of Plan	Highlights of the Plan	Noteworthy Accomplishments
<p>Houston, TX</p> <p>Budget (Proposed) Operating \$3.4 billion CIP \$1.1 billion Total \$4.5 Billion</p> <p>Population: 2.1 million (Metro area 5.9 million)</p> <p>Area: 599.6 square miles</p> <p>Government:: Strong-Mayor</p>	<p>5-Year Capital Improvement Plan (FY 2013-2017)</p> <p>Houston established a capital planning process in 1983. Public meetings are held annually in each City Council district to provide citizens an opportunity to comment on the process and recommend projects to be included in the plan. The plan is updated each year to include new projects, reflect changes in priorities, and extend the plan an additional year.</p> <p>City Departments/Agencies – Are responsible for need identification which starts with a comprehensive assessment of existing conditions. Continued advances in technology resulting in Citywide condition assessment data has made it possible to perform needs assessments proactively across large areas rather than being reactive when assets fail.</p> <p>Needs are identified when existing conditions do not meet Houston’s standards for level of service. Each infrastructure category has defined criteria establishing the level of service goal. Needs can be driven by the need to replace, to meet growth, or by regulatory requirements.</p> <p>Public Works and Engineering Department- Once the areas of highest needs are prioritized, pre-engineering is the tool for defining the problem and identifying. The Public Works and Engineering Department conducts all phases of project implementation.</p>	<p>The Capital Improvement Plan includes \$4.65 billion in appropriations over five years (FY 2013-2017). For ease of finding projects, the plan is organized by department, such as Parks and Recreation and Fire. Information is included on project priority, capacity and timing constraints, and funding sources for all anticipated projects. The two major categories of programs included in the plan are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enterprise – Enterprise fund programs make up \$3.07 billion or 66% of the total planned appropriations and are supported by revenues from the air travel industry, hotel occupancy tax, parking, and fees charged to water and wastewater commercial and residential customer. Public Improvements Program– The remaining \$1.58 billion or 34% addresses a full range of capital facility and infrastructure improvements which will be financed with \$625 million in Public Infrastructure General Obligation Bonds approved by voters in 2006 and other funding sources, such as grants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In 2011, the Public Works and Engineering Department developed a Capital Improvement Plan Process Manual to formalize processes and procedures for planning, including identifying needs and developing and prioritizing projects. The manual serves as guidance for asset-owning departments and provides consistency and transparency over the process. The City has developed a tool based on Geographic Information System to evaluate and compare condition assessment data citywide. This asset management tool is used to identify and prioritize needs for infrastructure improvement.

Profile (FY 2013)	Development of Plan	Highlights of the Plan	Noteworthy Accomplishments
<p>San Antonio, TX</p> <p>Budget (Proposed) Operating: \$1.6 billion CIP: \$ 636.4 million Total \$ 2.2 billion</p> <p>Population: 1.3 million (Metro area 2.1 million)</p> <p>Area: 460.9 square miles</p> <p>Government: City Manager</p>	<p>San Antonio's Six-Year Capital Improvement Plan (FY 2013-2018)</p> <p>City Departments/Agencies– City Departments involved in the Capital Program provide the Office of Management & Budget with new program requests, updated schedules, and cost information for ongoing and planned projects.</p> <p>Office of Management & Budget – In coordination with the Executive Leadership Team and the Finance Department, the Office of Management & Budget reviews the project proposals and the City's Debt Management Plan to ensure that recommended projects meet long-term infrastructure needs, service delivery plans, funding availability, and debt capacities.</p> <p>Capital Improvement Management Services– Responsible for overseeing the majority of CIP programs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bond programs • Public Safety projects • Air transportation • Libraries • Parks • Municipal facilities <p>Manages all phases of projects, including design, construction, and inspection.</p>	<p>The FY 2013-2018 Plan includes 454 projects totaling \$2 billion over six years. Projects include new streets and sidewalks, drainage enhancements, park and library facility rehabilitation, and public health and safety enhancements. Projects in the Capital Plan are evaluated each year to reflect changing priorities and current work progress and cost estimates.</p> <p>San Antonio's Capital Plan includes a debt management plan and has served as the foundation for two large-scale voter-approved GO Bond Programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2007-2012 Bond Program - Provided \$550 million for improvements to streets, bridges, and sidewalks; drainage; parks, recreation, open space, and athletics; library; and public health facilities. 84% percent of these projects are now complete. • 2012-2017 Bond Program - Provided \$596 million 140 projects primarily focused on the City's core infrastructure areas. <p>Other types of debt issued by the City that are non-voter authorized include Certificates of Obligation, Tax notes (short-term), and revenue bonds.</p>	<p>The Capital Improvement Management Services (CIMS) Department has an advanced website that provides transparency over the CIP and Bond Programs. http://www.sanantonio.gov/CIMS/?res=1280&ver=true</p> <p>The website includes the 2007 Bond Program Status Dashboard and Capital Projects Web View tool.</p>